



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

arranges its materials as to show their main and telling significance. Professor Prentice has performed a very difficult task well and his wide acquaintance with Syrian epigraphy and liturgies has served him in good stead. It may not be impertinent to add that the undogmatic modesty with which Professor Prentice writes makes the present reviewer feel that his already high estimate of this work would be still further enhanced by being in the presence of the stones themselves, many of which were examined again in the second Princeton expedition of 1905.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

De Apollonii Rhodii Elocutione. By GEORG BOESCH. Göttingen, 1908.

This doctor's dissertation, which has passed through the hands of the Berlin professors Wilamowitz and Wilhelm Schulze, deals in two chapters with so much of the diction of Apollonius of Rhodes as is included in his verbs. In the first chapter, the divergence of Apollonius from Homeric precedent in the form and use of verbs is discussed. The second chapter is devoted to verbs that are foreign to Homer.

In a brief introduction the author draws his lines of demarcation. The overshadowing influence of Homer upon the later Greek epic is, of course, to be assumed. Reference is made to subsidiary influence, proceeding from Hesiod, Aratus, Mimnermus, Philotas and Phanocles. The dependence of Apollonius upon Callimachus and Theocritus is reviewed in a conservative way. Imitations of the *Ilias Parva*, the Hymns, of Empedocles, Eumelus and Antimachus are shown. This survey of the earlier poets to whom Apollonius is indebted is not, however, the important thing. The real problem is to determine how the later poet has used his epic inheritance, by way of change, of innovation and of enrichment. To measure the degree of the later poet's divergence from Homer and to discover the causes of this divergence will show the extent to which the studious imitator of the past is a child of his own age. For not even the most scrupulous care in the use of an obsolete idiom can keep the poet of a later day entirely free from the living forces of the language that he daily uses. Prominent among these forces are analogy, and the demand for new expressions that correspond to new objects and ideas. The divergence of the later poet from Homer, when clearly perceived, reveals the forces that were active in the poet's own day. A knowledge of this divergence and of the causes which are behind it is of importance in estimating the poet's own work and the work of all of his kind; it is further of

value in that it affords a glimpse of the course which the language has taken during its history. As far as concerns Apollonius, there has been no dearth of investigations into the actual differences between Homer and the later epic. But there has been no corresponding attempt to determine causes. Dr. Boesch, then, proposes to deal with causes, to pass from facts to principles.

In considering Apollonius as a craftsman, two distinct influences are to be recognized as at work. These two influences are natural opposites, yet they coexist and oftentimes work side by side. On the one hand, Apollonius was acquainted with Homeric usage to the smallest detail. Dr. Boesch quotes with approval the conclusion of Witte: "Das Werk des Apollonius ist geschrieben auf Grund der umfassendsten Einzeluntersuchungen über Homer und seine Sprache; auf Grund von philologischen Untersuchungen, an die bis auf den heutigen Tag noch kein Moderner gedacht hat". On the other hand Apollonius often deviates from Homeric precedent in a way which can be explained only on the supposition that he was swayed by forces that were dominant in his own day. Apollonius archaizes, most minutely and laboriously. Yet he does not always archaize. A good example of the outworking of these two forces is to be found in the use of the prepositions in composition. That *εἰς* and *μετά*, as elements of compound words, were on the decline, has been observed for the later period. The usage of Apollonius registers, for a relatively early period, the same tendency; but for *εἰς*, only. He uses few non-Homeric compounds with *εἰς*, only four in all, whereas *ἐπί*, *ἀνά*, *διά*, and above all *σύν*, are freely applied to form new compounds, unknown to Homer. Many of these are of the poet's own coinage. In the case of *εἰς*, then, Apollonius reflects the situation of his own time. The opposite is true of *μετά*. Apollonius knew well that *μετά* was yielding to *σύν*, yet he coins a relatively large number of new compounds with *μετά*, all of them poetical in coloring. One other preposition, the poetical *ἀμφί*, is similarly treated.

The scrupulous attention which Apollonius paid to Homeric usage is shown, for example, in his avoidance of the future passive tense system, the future optative, and of adjectives in *-ικος* except within the narrow Homeric limits. In the light of these facts, Dr. Boesch disallows the possibility that Apollonius used *κοινός*, the later equivalent of the Homeric *ξυνός*. For *κοινήν* which has stood in the text of I. 103 since Brunck's day, he reads *κείνην*, "illam", i. e. famosam, appealing to the ancient tradition preserved in the scholia.

In respect of the voice of verbs, Apollonius presents certain novelties. In some verbs he uses a middle form for Homer's active, in others, an active for Homer's middle.¹ Again, a group of verbs; e. g., *ἐρπυθαίνω*, appears with a new active form and a

¹ Comp. A. J. P. IV 428; XXIII 131; XXVII 331; XXX 105.—B. L. G.

transitive meaning. These phenomena are in part traceable to the tendency of the later speech to create transitive actives out of intransitive middles. Instructive is the active *τεκταίνω*, for the earlier middle. Apollonius is here, as in the intransitive use of the active *κλίνω*, the herald of the Common Dialect, one of whose traits is the confusion of active and middle. Out of this confusion just the opposite result arises, in the case of *αἰτέω*, *τείνω*, *φαρμάσσω*, and *μετρέω*, whose middle forms are used by Apollonius with the force of the active. The use of the optative in a final clause, after a primary tense, in I. 657, 797, 1003; IV. 399, is interpreted by Dr. Boesch as a sign that the use of the optative was already on the wane: Apollonius is the forerunner of the decline which we find in Polybius and the almost total extinction of the optative in the New Testament writers.¹

Chapter II deals with verbs that are foreign to Homer. The problem here is two-fold: to determine, first, whether the word in question has been drawn from current usage or from a poetic source; and, further, when this question is settled, to determine what poets Apollonius has followed and on what dialectic foundation his idiom rests. Dr. Boesch gives a list of twenty-five verbs found in Apollonius but not found in the earlier epic. These verbs for the most part have associations with the Ionic dialect. More significant is the transitive use of *βλαστέω* found also in Hippocrates and in the LXX, and therefore referable to the popular Ionic speech. The unepic form *γατομεῖν*, II. 1005, owes its Doric *a* directly to Lycophron, ultimately to tragedy. The verb *ὀτλέω* has a similar history. Dr. Boesch finds other traces of indebtedness to Lycophron. Aratus, too, led the way in coining verbs *-αω*; e. g., *διχάω*, *σταλάω*. Apollonius not only borrows his new verbs, but makes the new ones *ἐπανθιάω*, *κατηφιάω*, *μεσημβριάω*. By way of explanation of these many new verbs, it is to be observed that the suffix was alive in the later period, as the *ἀγωνιάω* of Polybius, for example, shows. Further, these formations, especially in the participial mood, lent themselves easily to

¹ American scholars have employed themselves a good deal with Apollonius and Dr. Boesch might have found some interesting illustrations of his second section, 'Quanta subtilitate Apollonius Homerum imitatus sit', in Goodwin, *Apollonius Rhodius, His Figures, Syntax and Vocabulary* (J. H. U. Diss., 1891). Of course, Haggett, *A Comparison of Apollonius Rhodius and Homer in Prepositional Usage* (J. H. U. Diss., 1904) and Oswald, *The Prepositions in Apollonius Rhodius* (Cath. U. Diss., 1904) lie outside of Dr. Boesch's restricted range as does Apollonius' coincidence with Homer in the matter of *ὦ* with the vocative (A. J. P. XXIV 197). Needless to say, the authors of these dissertations were trained not merely to collect facts but also to study the conflict of linguistic development with artistic tradition so that the line of research marked out by Dr. Boesch was not unfamiliar to them, and the subtle variations from Homer have been illuminated by them also. Unfortunately, there is no clearinghouse for studies of this kind and the same grist has to be ground over and over again. Some years ago Schwyzer began a 'Jahresbericht' but he was evidently overwhelmed by the magnitude of his task, with which he wrestled manfully but in vain.—B. L. G.

the needs of the dactylic verse, just as did the adjectives in *-οεις*, of which Apollonius coins five, and the substantives in *-συνη*, of which he coins six. A parallel phenomenon is the multiplication of adjectives in *-αλεος* by Oppian.

The investigation of Dr. Boesch, presenting as it does a wide survey of the facts and dealing with a large mass of material offers to the special student of Apollonius much of value beyond what has been indicated in the above summary. I have attempted to give the author's point of view, his method of approach, believing that that is the most significant thing. Not only does he deal with the language of Apollonius as an historical problem, but he deals with it broadly, bringing prominently into consideration the common speech as well as the conventional literary language.

EDWARD FITCH.

CHRISTIAN HUELSEN, *The Roman Forum, its History and its Monuments*: translated by Jesse Benedict Carter. Second edition revised and enlarged. Rome, Loescher & Co., and New York, G. E. Stechert & Co., 1909. 271 pp. \$1.75.

During the last five years Professor Huelsen's little book has proved itself not only the most satisfactory of guides for the serious-minded layman but the best outline and introductory handbook for the professional student. Now, barely three years after the first appearance of the English version, based on the second German edition, we have new evidence of its popularity in the demand for a second issue. These years, it is true, have not been marked by such important discoveries in the Forum as those which aroused the enthusiasm of archaeologists in the years from 1899 to 1904, but there has been some progress and of this the author has in most cases taken full account. The useful bibliography (pp. 253-260) has been enlarged somewhat by the addition of references to the most recent literature and an entire new section has been added to the book to describe the *tribunal praetorium*. Other notable changes are the addition of the Latin text to the translations from Ovid (pp. 3 and 146), Plautus (p. 14), and Statius (pp. 142f.), here and there a correction of statement, and in many places a marked improvement from the point of view of English expression, though we are still occasionally reminded of the language which underlies the translation. Some of the cuts previously used have been omitted, but more have been added, bringing the total number of illustrations from 139 of the old edition up to 151. The most interesting of these are the Forum as represented in the plan of the Anonymus Einsidlensis (p. 30), and the photographs taken from a balloon under the